

## Remarks

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Of previously pending claims 1, 5-10, 14-17, 21-26, 30-32, and 38-47, all claims were rejected. Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 17, 24-26, 38, 39, 41, 43, 45, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over a paper by Grobe *et al.*, “Optical Metropolitan DWDM Networks – An Overview”, printed in October 2002 (hereinafter “Grobe”), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0264468, published December 2004 in the name of Horton *et al.* (hereinafter “Horton”) in further view of a paper entitled, “Clock Recovery for Circuit Emulation Services over ATM,” by L. Castel-Branco *et al.*, Proceedings of the International IFIP-IEEE Conference on Broad band Communications, 1996 (hereinafter “Castel-Branco”). To better point the differences between their claimed invention and the cited references, the applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 10, 17, 24, 26, 39, 43 and 47; and canceled claims 9 and 25.

The applicants believe that the rejection of their claims is unwarranted and address their arguments with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 17, 24, 38 and 39. Turning first to independent claims 1, 17 and 38, claim 1 was rejected by the combination of the Grobe, Horton and Castel-Branco references. The Horton reference purportedly teaches the step of “extracting selected bits from said sequence of horizontal scan lines to form data payloads,” but such is not the case. Rather, the cable modem system of the Horton reference removes portions of payload *headers*, not bits of the payload itself. In fact, the concept described in Horton is called Payload Header Suppression (PHS). See the first sentence of paragraph [0058]. Hence the Horton reference does not teach the extracting selected bits step.

Furthermore, the Examiner combines the stamp-counter value teaching of the Castel-Branco reference with the Grobe and Horton references. However, the Examiner fails to point out the need to recover the source clock frequency in the Grobe and Horton systems. In their perusal of these references, the applicants did not see a description for the need for such clock frequency recovery in the SONET/SDH (Synchronous Optical Network\Synchronous Digital Hierarchy) systems in the Grobe reference nor in the cable modem system in the Horton reference, and the Castel-Branco reference describes a Residual Time Stamp in the context of ATM (Asynchronous Transfer Mode) networks. There appears to be an improper reliance upon

the teachings of the current application to make the putative combination of references in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Consequently, claim 1 is not obvious over the cited prior art references and should be allowed. Independent 17 and 38 have similar limitations as claim 1 and should be allowable for the same reasons. Claims 5-7, 21-23, 40-41, 44-45 should also be allowed for at least being dependent upon allowable base claims 1 and 17.

With respect to independent claims 8, 24 and 39, the claims were rejected by the same basic reasoning as claim 1. As amended, the claims 8, 24 and 39 make more explicit the reciprocal limitations of the independent claims 1, 17 and 38. Claim 8, for example, reads:

A method for extracting a serial video data stream from a network transport digital signal formatted in accordance with a hierarchical digital transmission standard, said method comprising:  
    demapping GFP-T frames from a signal formatted in accordance with said hierarchical digital transmission standard;  
    deencapsulating said GFP-T frames to obtain payload headers and data payloads therein;  
    differentiating said data payloads from said payload headers;  
    forming horizontal scan lines of said serial video data stream from said data payloads, including inserting bytes into said data payloads;  
    buffering said horizontal scan lines in a buffer; and  
    recovering clock timing of said serial video data stream based on said horizontal scan lines from time-stamp counter values in said payload headers.

For the same reasons argued above, claim 8 is not obvious over the combination of cited references. For example, claim 8 recites the step of “forming horizontal scan lines of said serial video data stream from said data payloads, including inserting bytes into said data payloads.” Contrary to the Examiner’s reasoning, the Horton reference teaches that the repetitive portions of certain payload *headers* which had been removed by the transmitter are replaced by the receiver. See paragraph [0058], for example. The payloads remain unchanged. Furthermore, the combination of the Castel-Branco reference with the Grobe and Horton references for the clock timing based on “time-stamp counter values” is based upon hindsight, as argued previously. Claim 8 should be allowed.

Independent claims 24 and 39 have similar limitations as claim 8 and should be allowable. Claims 10, 14-16, 26, 30-32, 42-43, and 46-47 should also be allowed for at least being based upon allowable base claims.

Therefore, in view of amendments above and the remarks directed thereto, the applicants request that all rejections be removed, that claims 1, 5-8, 10, 14-17, 21-24, 26, 30-32, and 38-47 be allowed and the case be passed to issue. If a telephone conference would in any way expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is asked to call the undersigned at (408) 868-4088.

Respectfully submitted,

Aka Chan LLP

/Gary T. Aka/

Gary T. Aka  
Reg. No. 29,038

Aka Chan LLP  
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 710  
Santa Clara, CA 95050  
Tel: (408) 868-4088  
Fax: (408) 608-1599  
E-mail: [gary@akachanlaw.com](mailto:gary@akachanlaw.com)